

### **REMARKS**

The present Amendment amends claims 21, 24, 27, 29, 31, 32, 35-39, 41 and 42, leaves claims 23, 26, 30 and 34 unchanged, cancels claim 40 and adds new claims 43-55. Therefore, the present application has pending claims 21, 23, 24, 26, 27, 29-32, 34-39 and 41-55.

Subsequent to the issue of the April 15, 2004 Office Action, an Information Disclosure Statement was filed on April 20, 2004. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to consider the information cited in the April 20, 2004 Information Disclosure Statement and to indicate that such information has been considered.

Claims 21 and 24 stand rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regards as the invention. Various amendments were made throughout claims 21 and 24 to correct the informalities noted by the Examiner. Therefore, this rejection is overcome and should be withdrawn.

Specifically, amendments were made to claims 21 and 24 to overcome the objections noted by the Examiner in paragraph 4 of the Office Action.

The Examiner's cooperation is respectfully requested to contact Applicants' Attorney by telephone should any further indefinite matter be discovered so that appropriate amendments may be made.

Claims 21, 23, 24, 26, 27, 29-32 and 37-40 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hashemi (U.S. Patent No. 5,337,414) in view of Nakayama (U.S. Patent No. 5,920,893); claims 34, 35, 41 and 42 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hashemi in view of Nakayama

and further in view of Cheney (U.S. Patent No. 5,285,456); and claim 36 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hashemi in view of Nakayama and further in view of Dixon (U.S. Patent No. 4,637,024). As indicated above, claim 40 was canceled. Therefore, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 40 as being unpatentable over Hashemi in view of Nakayama is rendered moot. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

It should be noted that the present application is a continuation of application Serial No. 09/440,285, filed November 15, 1999, now abandoned; which is a continuation of application Serial No. 09/013,039, filed January 26, 1998, now U.S. Patent No. 6,012,119; which is a continuation of application Serial No. 08/819,625, filed March 17, 1997, now U.S. Patent No. 5,819,054; which is a continuation of application Serial No. 08/267,013, filed June 21, 1994 now abandoned. Thus, the present application claims a priority under 35 USC §120 of June 21, 1994 by way of its parent application Serial No. 08/267,013. The filing date of said parent application Serial No. 08/267,013 of June 21, 1994 predates the effective date of June 2, 1997 of Nakayama. Thus, Nakayama is not prior to the invention of the present application and therefore is not an appropriate reference to be used for anticipatory or obviousness type purposes to reject the claims of the present application. Therefore, each of the above noted rejections which rely primarily on a combination of Hashemi and Nakayama fails being that Nakayama cannot be used with Hashemi or any of the other references of record to reject the claims of the present application since Nakayama does not constitute prior art relative to the

present invention. Accordingly, each of the above noted rejections of the claims are rendered moot and therefore should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The remaining references used in the above noted rejections namely Hashemi, Cheney and Dixon have been previously shown in the Remarks of the March 31, 2004 Amendment, said Remarks being incorporated herein by reference, that they do not teach or suggest the features of the present invention whether taken individually or in combination with each other. Even if Nakayama could be used it also does not teach or suggest the deficiencies of Hashemi, Cheney and Dixon. Therefore, the combination of Nakayama with anyone or more of Hashemi, Cheney and Dixon would still fail to teach or suggest the features of the present invention as recited in the claims.

Therefore, in light of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the above described rejections under 35 USC §103 based on the combination of Hashemi, Nakayama, Cheney and Dixon is respectfully requested.

As noted above, the present Amendment adds new claims 43-55. New claims 43-55 recites many of the same features recited in claims 21, 23, 24, 26, 27, 29-32, 34-39, 41 and 42 which are not taught or suggested by any of the references of record particularly Hashemi, Nakayama, Cheney and Dixon whether taken individually or in combination with each other. Therefore, new claims 43-55 recite features of the present invention not taught or suggested by the prior art of record for the same reasons as claims 21, 23, 24, 26, 27, 29-32, 34-39, 41 and 42 as noted above.

The remaining references of record have been studied. Applicants submit that they do not supply any of the deficiencies noted above with respect to the references utilized in the rejection of claims 21, 23, 24, 26, 27, 29-32, 34-39, 41 and 42.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 21, 23, 24, 26, 27, 29-32, 34-39 and 41-55 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of claims 21, 23, 24, 26, 27, 29-32, 34-39 and 41-55 is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, the applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of Antonelli, Terry, Stout & Kraus, LLP, Deposit Account No. 01-2135 (500.33021CX5).

Respectfully submitted,

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP



---

Carl I. Brundidge  
Registration No. 29,621

CIB/jdc  
(703) 312-6600